REASONS TERMINOLOGY FOR BREEDING CATTLE
By Chris Skaggs, Assistant Professor, Texas A&M University
and Chris T. Boleman, Texas A&M University

Breeding animals are generally placed on a combination of:
✓ Frame-Growth potential
✓ Body capacity or body volume
✓ Structural Correctness
✓ Muscle
✓ Balance
✓ Feminine/masculine characteristics
✓ Correctness of condition

FRAME TERMINOLOGY

Advantages
Larger framed
Larger, growthier
Showed greater length and extension
through his front end
More future growth and outcome
Appeared to be faster growing
Appears to have a higher W.D.A. in class

Criticisms
Smaller framed
Less future and outcome
Quicker patterned
Lower W.D.A. in class

BODY CAPACITY OR BODY VOLUME TERMINOLOGY

Advantages
Broodier (females only)
More capacious
Higher volume
More overall dimension and capacity
Wider chested
Opens up more correctly behind his shoulders
Bolder sprung
More spring of forerib
Deeper and more expandable in his rib
More circumference of heart
Deeper ribbed
Substance of bone

Criticisms
Tight ribbed
Narrow gauged
Narrow chested
Constricted in his fore rib
Shallow bodied
STRUCTURAL CORRECTNESS TERMINOLOGY

Advantages
Longer, freer striding
Freer, more fluid stride
Easier moving
Traveled with a longer, more
confident stride
Traveled truer off his (front, rear) legs
Moved with more flex to his hock
More (correct, desirable) set to his
hock
Due to advantage in slope of shoulder
takes a longer stride in front
More desirable slope of shoulder
More angle to shoulder
Truer tracking
Squarer on feet and legs

Criticisms
Short, tight stride off both ends
Restricted in movement
Sickle hocked
Cow hocked
Buckled over in front
Toed out up front
Straight shouldered
Post legged
Straight in the hock
Tight in the hip

MUSCLE TERMINOLOGY

Advantages
Heavier muscled
More expressively muscled
More volume of muscle
More natural thickness
Thicker topped
More muscular expression (loin,
rump, stifle, quarter)
Thickness (top, stifle, lower
quarter)
Meatier topped
Wider from stifle to stifle
Thicker, squarer rump
Greater center thickness of quarter
Deeper quartered
More bulge (top, stifle, and lower
quarter)
Wider tracking

Criticisms
Light muscled
Flat quartered
Flat loin
Narrow topped
Tapered into his lower quarter
Flatter stifled
Shallow quartered
Narrow tracking

BALANCE TERMINOLOGY

Advantages
More stylish
Cleaner patterned
Nicer balanced
Eye appealing
Nicer profiling
Smother
Leveler (topped, hipped, rump)
Squarer (hip, rump)

Criticisms
Coarse
Weak topped
Ill made
Poorly balanced
Droops at his/her hip
FEMININE AND MASCULINE CHARACTERISTICS

FEMININE

Advantages
- More femininity through her head, neck and shoulder
- More angular fronted
- Longer necked
- Cleaner necked
- Smoother blending through her front end
- Blends smoother through neck-shoulder junction
- Blends smoother from shoulder to fore rib
- More advanced in udder development

Criticisms
- Coarse fronted
- Short necked
- Round shouldered
- Coarser made
- Wasty fronted
- Leathery female

MASCULINE

Advantages
- More rugged
- More masculine
- More testicular development
- More desirable scrotal shape
- Tighter sheath

Criticisms
- Refined
- Less testicular development
- Loose sheath
- Twisted testicle

CONDITION TERMINOLOGY

Advantages
- Easier fleshing
- Lighter conditioned
- More desirable degree of condition
- Freer of fat through through the lower 1/3
- Trimmer through (Brisket, flank, and udder)

Criticisms
- Harder fleshing
- Harder doing
- Less condition
- Wastier
- Excessive degree of condition
- Wasty through (brisket, flank, and udder)
- Fatter
REASONS TERMINOLOGY FOR MARKET LAMBS
By Chris Skaggs, Assistant Professor, Texas A&M University
and Chris T. Boleman, Texas A&M University

Market steers are generally placed on a combination of:
✓ Muscle
✓ Correctness of finish
✓ Body capacity or body volume
✓ Growth and Performance
✓ Structural correctness
✓ Balance

MUSCLE TERMINOLOGY

Advantages
Heavier muscled
More muscular
Thicker made
Showed more natural thickness
More muscular (forearm, top, rump, leg)
More bulge and expression...
Meater topped
Showed more expression of muscling
Fuller and squarer out his dock
Thicker leg
More thickness from end to end
Meater, deeper (rack, loin)
More spread down his top
Longer loined
Heavier, deeper, thicker, plumper leg
Thicker through (top, stifle, lower) leg
More inner bulge and outer flare to leg
Deeper through twist
Wider tracking

Criticisms
Less muscular
Tapers from end to end
Flat in stifle
Narrow out his (rump, dock)
Tapers out his dock
Narrow and tapering leg
Shallow loined
Narrow topped
Short hindsaddled
Narrow, shallow, fat leg

CORRECTNESS OF FINISH TERMINOLOGY-LEANNESS

Advantages
Firmer
Lighter conditioned
More correctly conditioned
Firmer handling
Freer of excess condition
Trimmer through (breast, fore rib)
Trimmer
Trimmer middled
Fresher handling
Cleaner middled
More correctly finished

Criticisms
Patchy over his ribs
Over finished
Fatter
Wastier
Uneven in finish
Rough over the rump and dock
Heavy conditioned
Soft over fore rib
Wasty breasted
Heavy middled
Excessively finished
BODY CAPACITY OR BODY VOLUME TERMINOLOGY

Advantages
More capacious
Higher volume
Deeper bodied
Wider chested
Wider based
Bolder sprung
More spring of fore and rear rib
Deeper ribbed
Deeper hearted
Wider through floor of chest
More spring of rib
More arch of rib

Criticisms
Shallow bodied
Narrow based
Shallow through fore and rear rib
Shallow ribbed
Flat ribbed
Tight in the fore rib
Pinched in fore rib
Tight in heart
Narrow gauged
Narrow chested

GROWTH-PERFORMANCE TERMINOLOGY

Advantages
Growthier
More size and scale
Larger framed
Taller fronted
Showed greater length and extension
Longer, stretchier, more length
More extended in growth curve
 Appears to have a higher W.D.A. in class

Criticisms
Smaller framed
Short coupled
Short fronted
Lower W.D.A. in class

STRUCTURAL CORRECTNESS TERMINOLOGY

Advantages
Squarer on feet and legs
Stronger pasterns
Stands wider based
More correct in the set of his legs
More correct in his feet and pasterns
Straighter and stronger on both front
and rear legs
Stood sounder and stronger on his
pasterns
Longer, freer striding
Freer, more fluid stride
More structurally correct
Wider tracking
Stands on more substance of bone
Stands on more rugged bone
Easier moving

Criticisms
Short, restricted stride
Sickle hocked
Stands close at the hocks
Toes out
Weak pasterns
Stands narrow based
Excessive set to the hock
Straight hocked
Toes-in
Buck kneeed
Straight shouldered
Moved underneath himself
Narrow tracking
Fine-boned
Light boned
GENERAL APPEARANCE-BALANCE TERMINOLOGY

Advantages
More stylish
Cleaner patterned
Eye appealing
Smouter shouldered
Squerer (dock, rump)
More symmetry, more balance
Straitlger lined
Taller fronted
Longer necked
More extension throughout
Smooter made
Neck blends smounter into shoulder
Trimmer fronted
Lays in neater and tighter in shoulder
Stronger topped
Longer (hindsaddle, loin, rump, dock)
More level rumped/docked
Longer and leveler out his dock

Criticisms
Coarse shouldered
Weak topped
Short fronted
Short coupled
Ewe necked
Heavy fronted
Wasty fronted
Breaks behind shoulder
Short sided
Tapers out dock
Steep (rump, dock)
Droops out dock

CARCASS TERMINOLOGY

Advantages
Hang a more muscular, more shapely carcass
Meatier carcass
Should rail a higher cutability carcass
More muscular carcass
Trimmer carcass
Should rail a carcass with a higher leg conformation score
Should have a carcass with less retail fat trim
Should rail a carcass yielding more total pounds or more desirable product

Criticisms
Lower cutability
Lighter muscled
Fatter
Wastier
Lower leg conformation score
Less total pounds of product
REASONS TERMINOLOGY FOR MARKET STEERS
By Chris Skaggs, Assistant Professor, Texas A&M University
and Chris T. Boleman, Texas A&M University

Market steers are generally placed on a combination of:
✓ Muscle
✓ Correctness of finish
✓ Body capacity or body volume
✓ Growth
✓ Structural correctness
✓ Balance

MUSCLE TERMINOLOGY

Advantages
- Heavier muscled
- More expressively muscled
- More volume of muscle
- More natural thickness
- Thicker topped
- More muscular expression (loin, rump, stifle, quarter)
- Thickness (top, stifle, lower quarter)
- Meatier topped
- Wider from stifle to stifle
- Thicker, squarer rump
- Greater center thickness of quarter
- Deeper quartered
- More bulge (top, stifle, and lower quarter)
- Wider tracking

Criticisms
- Light muscled
- Flat quartered
- Flat loin
- Narrow topped
- Tapered into his lower quarter
- Flatter stifled
- Shallow quartered
- Narrow tracking

CORRECTNESS OF FINISH TERMINOLOGY

Advantages
- More correctly finished steer
- Nicer handling steer as he....
- More nearly correct in the degree of condition down his top and over his ribs
- More (uniformly, evenly) covered
- Firmer and/or fresher handling
- More desirable degree of condition
- Freer of fat through the lower 1/3
- Trimmer through (brisket, flank)

Criticisms
- Fatter
- Patchy
- Stale
- Less condition
- Barer handling
- Softer handling
- Wastier
- Marginal degree of condition
- Excessive degree of condition
- Wasty through (brisket, flank)
BODY CAPACITY OR BODY VOLUME TERMINOLOGY

Advantages
More spacious
Higher volume
More overall dimension and capacity
Wider chested
Opens up more correctly behind his shoulders
Bolder sprung
More spring of forerib
Deeper and more expandable in his rib
More circumference of heart
Deeper ribbed

Criticisms
Tight ribbed
Narrow gauged
Narrow chested
Constricted in his fore rib
Shallow bodied

FRAME TERMINOLOGY

Advantages
Larger framed
Larger, growthier
Showed greater length and extension through his front end
More future growth and outcome
Appeared to be faster growing
Appears to have a higher W.D.A. in class

Criticisms
Smaller framed
Less future and outcome
Quicker patterned
Lower W.D.A. in class

STRUCTURAL CORRECTNESS TERMINOLOGY

Advantages
Longer, freer striding
Freer, more fluid stride
Easier moving
Traveled with a longer, more confident stride
Traveled truer off his (front, rear) legs
Moved with more flex to his hock
More (correct, desirable) set to his hock
Due to advantage in slope of shoulder takes a longer stride in front
More desirable slope of shoulder
More angle to shoulder
Truer tracking
Squarer on feet and legs

Criticisms
Short, tight stride off both ends
Restricted in movement
Sickle hocked
Cow hocked
Buckled over in front
Toed out up front
Straight shouldered
Post legged
Straight in the hock
Tight in the hip
GENERAL APPEARANCE-BALANCE TERMINOLOGY

Advantages
More stylish
Cleaner patterned
Nicer balanced
Eye appealing
Nicer profiling
Smother
Leveler (topped, hipped, rump)
Squarer (hip, rump)

Criticisms
Coarse
Weak topped
Ill made
Poorly balanced
Droops at his/her hip

CARCASS TERMINOLOGY

Advantages
Quality
Should hang a carcass more apt to grade Choice
Higher quality grading carcass
Should have an advantage in quality grading situations

Criticisms
Quality
Lower quality
Less likely to reach the Choice grade
Poorer quality
Less apt to grade Choice

Cutability or Yield Grade
Produce a carcass with a more desirable yield grade
Rail a carcass with a lower numerical yield grade
Higher cutability carcass
Trimmer carcass
Requiring less fat trim
Hang a more muscular, more shapely carcass
Yield a meatier (more muscular) carcass

Cutability or Yield Grade
Lower cutability
Poorer cutability
More retail fat trim
Less muscular
Lighter muscled
Fatter
Wastier
Sample Sets of Oral Reasons for Livestock Judging Contests

by former members of Texas A&M University Livestock Judging Teams

MARKET STEER SAMPLE REASONS by Chapel Schuessler

"I placed this class of market steers 2-1-4-3. I initiated the class with 2, as he was the most complete steer in terms of growth, leaness, and muscularity. If I could change my class winner, I would like to see him thicker and fuller through his lower quarter. Nonetheless, in my top pair of more packer acceptable black steers, it's 2 over 1 as he is leaner. He is trimmer through his brisket and flank region and handles leaner over his 12th and 13th rib. Also, he exhibits a thicker and more expressive top. He's a larger outlined, longer cleaner fronted calf who is longer from hooks to pins. He certainly would take to the rail a carcass that was trimmer designed and higher cutability.

I grant that I showed the most volume and dimension through his lower quarter. He was a wider based steer who was mellower handling. But after this, he was a shorter, coarser fronted calf who was waster through his lower 1/3, so he is second.

Even so, in my middle pair it's easily 1 over 4 as he was simply heavier muscled. He showed more thickness, shape and dimension down his top; he was wider and more powerful out of his hip; and he maintained this advantage through his lower quarter. He was a wider chested, deeper ribbed, boulder sprung, higher volumed calf who was stouter designed and more correctly conditioned. Carcass wise, he should produce more total pounds of a high quality product.

I realize the Shorthorn appearing calf was the leanest in the class. But, unfortunately, he also was the harshest handling narrowest chested and flattest ribbed, so he is third.

Moving to my bottom pair of contrasting types, cutability places 4 over 3 as he was leaner. He handled leaner from his fore to rear rib and was trimmer through his cod. He would certainly rail a carcass with a lower numerical yield grade. Additionally, he's a thicker topped calf who ties in smoother through his neck shoulder junction, he's leveler down his top and squarer out of his hip.

I recognize the fact that the Hereford appearing calf was heavier conditioned and deeper ribbed. But he was the fattest, waviest fronted calf who was easy in his top. Quite simply, he would take to the rail the fattest, lowest cutability carcass, so he's last.

PERFORMANCE BULLS SAMPLE REASONS by Chris Boleman.

I placed the performance Limousin bulls 2-4-3-1. The scenario dictates a growthy, heavy muscled bull. Thus, 2 sorts to the top of the class. 2 is the heaviest muscled, most durably designed and most capacious bull. Ideally, I would like to see him smoother out of his shoulder. Nonetheless, in my top pair of higher performing red bulls, it is 2 over 4. 2 is a deeper ribbed, more capacious bull. But most importantly, he is heavier muscled bull that shows more shape and expression down his top, is wider at his stifles, and ties this advantage to a thicker quarter. In addition, he is the highest in his growth EPDs. Due to his advantages in growth and muscularity, he should sire offspring demanding the greatest premium when sold on a grade and yield basis.

Yes, 4 is a larger framed, longer sided, longer hipped bull that is more structurally correct and offers greater longevity in the breeding herd. But, after this, he is flat ribbed and narrow gauged, so he is second.
Nonetheless, in my middle decision, it is 4 over 3. 4 is a larger framed, longer bodied, growthier bull that offers more length and extension when viewed from the side. Coupled with the fact that he is higher in his growth EPDs, he should sire offspring that reach slaughter weight at an earlier age.

I do realize that 3 is a leaner, heavier muscled bull that should produce offspring excelling in cutability, but at the same time, 3 is round in his muscle pattern, coarse in his shoulder, and small in his frame so he is third.

Moving to my bottom decision of lower performing black bulls, it is 3 over 1. Quite simply, there is more bull there. He is a heavier muscled, larger framed, growthier bull that has more body capacity. He opens with more width to his chest as well as more depth and spring of rib.

Yes, 1 is the leanest in his backfat EPD, but after this, he is the smallest, lightest muscled, shallowest bodied bull of the four. Quite simply, he is the least scenario adaptable bull in this class.

**CROSSBRED MARKET HOGS SAMPLE REASONS** by Dalton Nix

I placed the crossbred market hogs 1, 4, 2, and 3. I started with the most powerful muscled barrow that combined leanness and structural correctness to the highest degree. No, he wasn’t the largest scaled and I’d like to see him leveler hipped, nonetheless, in the top pair of more product oriented, blue rumped barrows, it’s 1 over 4. I was the most expressively muscled. He displayed a distinct groove down his top and dimple above his tailhead. Plus he exhibited more bulge and thickness to the center and lower portions of his ham. This, coupled with the fact that he was cleaner in his elbow pockets and leaner over the turn of his loin edge, should lead to the most shapely, muscular carcass with the highest % lean. Finally, he was more structurally sound, as he stepped out with more flex and give to his hip, hocks, and pasterns allowing him to move with a more fluid stride.

I realize 4 is larger outlined, pounds heavier, and higher volumed; but at the same time he’s pushing more fat in his shoulder pockets, he’s short framed, tight hipped, and more restricted in his movement. So he’s second.

Even so, in the middle pair it’s 4 over 2. 4 was a more carcass oriented barrow that was wider in his skeletal design. He opened up wider through his chest floor, stepped out on a bigger, bolder blade and spread more thickness and dimension of muscling down his top. Plus, he came out squarer and wider at his hip, where he exhibited more volume and expression of muscling to all portions of his ham. Finally, due to his advantages in muscling, he should demand a premium if marketed on a grade and yield basis.

I readily admit 2 was longer fronted and looser structured, but I faulted the floppy-eared barrow and left him third as he was lighter muscled, narrower designed, toed out on his front end, and was weak in his pasterns.

Despite this, in the final comparison I used 2 over 3. 2 was more durable constructed and wider centered. He exhibited more shape and thickness down his top, was squarer rumped, and attained this advantage to thicker more expressively muscled lower ham. Along with this, he tracked out wider and squarer on both ends and should yield a carcass with more pounds of merchandisable product.

I concede 3 was the nicest balanced, longest sided, and leveler designed in the class; but this simply doesn’t compensate for the fact that the white hog was the lightest muscled and the narrowest designed. He tapered through his hip and was flat though his lower ham. Quite simply, he should offer the least muscular carcass in the class.

**SUFFOLK EWES SAMPLE REASONS**

I placed this class of Suffolk ewes 4-2-1-3. I started off the class with 4 as she best combined frame, capacity, and breed character. Ideally, I would have liked to have seen my class winner stronger on her pasterns and straighter on her front feet as she was splay footed. Nonetheless, I still preferred 4 over 2 in my initial placing as she was an especially larger framed ewe that stood in more length of cannon. 4 was also a higher volumed ewe that was deeper and bolder sprung about her rib. Finally, she had the best Suffolk head in the class as she was blacker at her points and had a more bell-shaped ear.
I will admit that 2 was more feminine through her front end as she was longer necked and she blended more smoothly through her shoulder. However, I fault her as she was bow-legged on her rear legs and was the lightest muscled ewe of the class.

In my middle decision it's still 2 over 1 as she was a more feminine ewe that was longer necked and was laid in flatter and smoother through the shoulder. She was a more symmetrical ewe that blended more smoothly from front to rear. Finally, and most importantly, 2 was more correct being stronger racked and leveler docked.

There is no doubt that 1 was blacker at the base of her ear, she too was heavier muscled being thicker through her center and lower leg but she stays 3rd as she was weak topped, droopy docked, and restricted in her movement off her rear legs.

In my final pair, I preferred 1 over 3 as she was simply larger framed and more extended, and exhibited more potential for future growth and outcome. Additionally, I was a higher quality ewe that was more feminine about her head.

I will grant that 3 is a higher volumed ewe in proportion to her body size being especially bolder ribbed, furthermore she is heavier muscle having width down her top and more volume to her leg, but that simply does not compensate for the fact that she has the poorest breed character being brown on her legs and on her poll, and is the least feminine, smallest framed, and earliest maturing ewe in the class.

MARKET LAMBS SAMPLE REASONS
I aligned the market lambs 4-3-2-1. I started the class with 4 as he best combined muscle, leanness and balance to the greatest degree. NO, my class winner wasn't the biggest statured nor was he the longest hindsaddled lamb in the class. Nevertheless, in my initial decision it's 4 over 3. 4 was a nicer balanced, more structurally correct lamb as he was smoother shouldered, stronger topped, leveler docked, and stood straighter and squarer on his feet and legs. In addition, 4 was heavier muscled as he displayed more volume to his forearm, more thickness to his top and met my hands with a fuller, plumper leg. He too was trimmer patterned and lighter conditioned as he handled with more distinction down his top with less cover over his fore and rear rib and was cleaner about his breast and lower one-third. Finally, due to his advantages of muscle and trimness, 4 should go to the rail with a superior cutability. Now, I admit that 3 was a bigger framed lamb that was longer loaned, but at the same time he was narrow made, light muscled, and handled with a greater degree of finish that did my class winner.

Nevertheless, in my middle comparison it's 3 over 2. 3 was a bigger, growthier, pounds heavy lamb that exhibited more apparent weight per day of age. HE too was a bigger statured more extended lamb that was especially more elongated from his last rib back. Moreover, 3 was a bigger volumed lamb that was wider through his chest floor and exhibited more dimension to his rib as he was deeper bodied. Finally, due to his advantages of size and scale, he should go to the rail with more total pounds of merchandisable product.

Now, I concede that the ewe lamb was more expressive in her muscle and lighter conditioned, but at the same time she was small framed and pounds light in relation to my top pair.

Finally, in my concluding decision it's 2 over 1. The ewe lamb was much heavier muscled as she handled with more volume to her forearm, more thickness and dimension to her rack and loin and more volume and expression to her center and lower leg. Furthermore, 2 was lighter conditioned as she handled with less cover down her top, over her rib and was cleaner about her breast. Finally, due to 2's muscle advantages, she should go to the rail with a more shapely carcass. Now, I realize that the black lamb was bigger framed and longer loaned. But that simply doesn't compensate for the fact that I was narrow made, light muscled and heavy conditioned. Quite simply I would go to the rail with the poorest cutability, least valued carcass in the class.

Produced by the TAMU Department of Animal Science, The Texas A&M University System
Additional information on animal science topics and junior beef cattle information can be found on the Web at http://animalscience.tamu.edu.
Extension publications can be found on the Web at: http://tcebooksbookstore.org
Visit Texas Cooperative Extension at: http://texasextension.tamu.edu

Educational programs of Texas Cooperative Extension are open to all people without regard to race, color, sex, disability, religion, age or national origin. Issued in furtherance of Cooperative Extension Work in Agriculture and Home Economics, Acts of Congress of May 8, 1914, as amended, and June 30, 1914, in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture, Chester P. Fehlis, Director, Texas Cooperative Extension, The Texas A&M University System.
Market Steers
Mark Hoge

I placed the market steers 3-1-4-2. I started with the black baldy steer, as he best ties muscle and balance in the smoothest pattern package of the class. More specifically, he is the longer profiling, cleaner fronted steer that is leveler hipped and he ties deeper into his quarter. Additionally, he more easily separates himself from the class when I handled him, as he is a meatier top steer that is the most uniformly finished over his rib. I recognize 1 has more bone but comparatively, he is short bodied and more open in the rear rib. However, his advantage is balance as it allows him to place over 4 in my close middle pair. Not only is he bolder hearted, bigger bodied, and a more attractive profiling steer that is more acceptable in frame size, he is also a longer striding steer that has more flex to his hock. On the other hand, the grey steer is beefier top and longer bodied. Yet, he is a courser made steer that is tighter ribbed than my top pair. Nevertheless, the cutability logically places 4 over 2 in my final pair. In relation to 2, 4 is a wider chested steer that is bolder in his forearm. Just as importantly, he has more dimension to his top and more expression of muscle through his stifle. Consequently I would expect him to rail in an advantage in his primal yield. I realize that 2 is stronger topped, but at the same time he's the thinnest stifle and narrowest tracking who is also the straightest fronted.
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